



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,507	04/06/2000	Giampiero M. Sierra	MS1-486US	9078

22801 7590 09/10/2002

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/544,507

Applicant(s)

SIERRA ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 3, 11, and 19, the word "about" renders the claim indefinite because it gives unclear limitations.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1, 6-9, 14-17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bates et al ("Bates", US #6,337,702).

As per independent claim 1, Bates teaches a method comprising:

displaying at least one user input field within a graphical user interface (146 of fig. 5); and

Art Unit: 2174

automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field through a non-modal mechanism within the graphical user interface (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Bates teaches the non-modal mechanism includes a tip balloon (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Bates teaches the tip balloon is graphically associated with a manual hint input mechanism within the graphical user interface (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Bates teaches the tip balloon is operatively associated with the manual hint input mechanism thereby allowing the user to selectively display the reminder information associated with the user input field through the non-modal mechanism (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18).

As per independent claim 9, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 9, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 17, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 17, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 23, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Clark et al ("Clark", US #5,995,101).

As per claims 2 and 3, which are dependent on claims 1 and 2 respectively, Bates teaches automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field through a non-modal mechanism within the graphical user interface (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18). Bates does not disclose monitoring user input activities and automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field through a non-modal mechanism after a defined period of user inactivity wherein the defined period of user inactivity is greater than three seconds. Clark discloses a tool tip feature initiated after a predetermined amount of time, or trigger interval, of user inactivity (col. 2, lines 34-40); also, because the predetermined amount of time is

Art Unit: 2174

determined by the user (col. 1, lines 54-55), it could be set to be greater than three seconds. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Clark of automatically displaying a tool tip feature after a predetermined amount of time (greater than three seconds) of user input inactivity in Bates' method since it would further make it easier and more convenient for users to remember their information without having them doing it manually.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy (US #5,425,102) in view of Bates.

As per independent claim 1, Moy teaches a method comprising:

displaying at least one user input field within a graphical user interface (fig. 3).

Moy discloses automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field within the graphical user interface (fig. 4), but he does not disclose that being done through a non-modal mechanism. Bates discloses that in fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Bates of automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field through a non-modal

mechanism within the graphical user interface in Moy's method since it would be faster to display reminder information without interfering with the user's working window.

As per claims 4 and 5, which are dependent on claim 1 and 4 respectively, Moy teaches the user input field is configured to input a password (fig. 3), and the reminder information includes user provided password reminder information (fig. 4; col. 3, lines 61-68).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat. 5736984 to Jellinek et al. discloses method and system for embedded feedback message and graphical processing element.

US Pat. 5895455 to Bellinger et al. discloses document image display system and method.

US Pat. 5956709 to Xue discloses dynamic data assembling on internet client side.

US Pat. 5991882 to O'Connell. discloses automated password reset.

Art Unit: 2174

US Pat. 6100885 to Donnelly et al. discloses supporting modification of properties via a computer system's user interface.

***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen  
September 4, 2002

*Kristine Kincaid*  
**KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**